THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JANUARY, 1916

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and thirty seven Branch Committees; 36,761 members in 443 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. JOHN BALCH, President
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY
MISS ANNA L. DAWES
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY
Vice Presidents
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS MARY S. AMES, Chairman of Executive Committee
MRS. WILLIAM LOWELL PUTNAM — Chairman of Education and Organization Committee, Chairman of County Committee
MRS. EDWIN FORD, Vice Chairman, County Committee.
MRS. B. L. ROBINSON, President Public Interests League
MRS. A. J. GEORGE, Field Secretary
MRS. S. REED ANTHONY, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y. Room 615 Kensington Building, Boston.

** Net present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

A SMASHING SUFFRAGE DEFEAT

In 1895, when a referendum was taken upon the expediency of giving the municipal ballot to Massachusetts women, 86,970 men voted in favor of the proposal, and 186,976 voted against it,—an adverse majority of 100,006. Last November, on the proposal to strike the word "male" from the Constitution, thereby conferring full suffrage upon women, 162,492 men voted in favor, and 295,939 against—an adverse majority of 133,447. The vote of 1895 resulted in the heaviest majority ever given, up to that date, against any proposition submitted to the people of Massachusetts; but the adverse majority last November was 33,441 larger than that of 1895. The net result of twenty years of suffrage agitation, culminating in a campaign of persistent misrepresentation and extraordinary bitterness, is this increase of more than 33,000 in the anti-suffrage majority. Suffrage leaders who profess to find encouragement in these figures, and who argue, as Miss Blackwell does, that suffrage has "gained ground," are welcome to all the consolation they can get, but the vote speaks for itself.

If this heavy majority against the suffrage amendment had been registered only in the cities and large towns, the suffragists might have found some comfort in charging that it was the work of sinister interests. But when, out of 354 cities and towns, 352 voted against suffrage and only two voted in favor of it—many of the smaller towns giving a majority of three to one against it—that explanation will scarcely deceive any one.

Any effort which Massachusetts suffragists may make to persuade the Legislature this year to take favorable action upon any suffrage proposal will be futile. Every member of the Legislature knows that his constituents, on the direct issue and by a vote large beyond precedent, have declared against suffrage. Why should he affront them by voting to thrust the same issue upon them? Or, still worse, why should he attempt to nullify their vote by enacting a Presidential suffrage bill over their heads? That is what the New Jersey suffragists proclaim their purpose to attempt; but they will be taught a lesson if they try it after the emphatic defeat of the suffrage amendment at the polls. If Massachusetts suffragists imitate their folly, they will fare badly in the Legislature.

Every one of the sixteen Massachusetts Representatives in Congress knows that the voters of his district have just rejected woman suffrage by a two to one majority. He is likely to bear this fact in mind when the suffragists try to cajole him into voting for a federal amendment which could not be submitted to the voters, and which would make such states as Nevada, with a population of 81,875, as powerful in deciding the result as Massachusetts with a population of 3,366,416. When suffragists threaten him with defeat if he does not do their bidding, he will remember that it is not the suffragists but the constituencies which have just voted heavily against suffrage that are to do the electing next November. He can listen to the suffrage threats with composure, remembering that it is the prime function of a Representative to represent his constituents, and that there can be no doubt what his constituents want of him in this matter.

The suffrage defeat of the 2d of November will be as far-reaching in its results as it is unmistakable in its significance.

Now and then words of wisdom fall even from the lips of Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch. For example, her statement that "another referendum in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts or Pennsylvania would only bring a worse defeat than the recent one."

WHICH SHOULD COUNT WITH CONGRESS?

There are eleven Double-Suffrage States, with a total population of a little more than eight million.

There are eleven male suffrage States which have rejected Woman Suffrage Amendments within the last four years. These States have a total population of thirty-seven million.

When Congress is asked to vote for a Federal Suffrage Amendment, which body of people should it represent — the eight million or the thirty-seven million?

THE FEDERAL AMENDMENT CAMPAIGN

SUFFRAGE CONGRESSMEN OPPOSE IT

(Senator Borah of Idaho in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer September 19, 1915.)

"THIS question of determining the franchise is peculiarly and wholly a state matter. It has been considered so from the beginning. The fifteenth amendment modifies as to discrimination, but the power to determine who shall vote is still left to the state. To take away from states the right to determine who shall vote within their respective jurisdictions is to carry away the last vestige of the integrity of the state. So believing, you will understand, of course, there is no possibility of my changing my views."

—

(Congressman Esch of Wisconsin to a Suffrage Delegation at La Crosse, October 7, 1915.)

"I VOTED for the suffrage referendum in Wisconsin, and will do so again if it comes up. But my district voted against it by 7,000, and the state of Wisconsin by 92,000. I therefore voted against the constitutional amendment when it came up in Congress. I am with you in any efforts you may make to convince the men of Wisconsin that suffrage is a good thing, but I am not in favor of forcing suffrage on an unwilling state by the outside pressure of a United States constitutional amendment."

—

(Congressman Beakes of Michigan to a Suffrage Delegation at Ann Arbor, October 23, 1915.)

"THIS question was before the last Congress, and then I voted against it. I do not get my right to vote from the federal constitution. I get it from the state constitution. There is where you must get your right. If the federal constitution has the right to confer equal suffrage, it has the right to take it away. I would not be in favor of putting into the federal constitution an amendment which would take away the right of equal suffrage from the eleven states which are now enjoying it."

—

(Senator Cummins of Iowa to a Suffrage Delegation at Des Moines, October 30, 1915.)

"YOU are making a tactical mistake in trying to get the ballot through national rather than state legislation. You need the assent of thirty-six states for a national amendment. Twelve states can block your game. That is a terrific handicap. Second, many persons who actually favor suffrage are against the national government granting it, because, they say, the act would be an invasion of state rights. You are free from these two enormous difficulties in state campaigns."

INFLUENTIAL NEWSPAPERS OPPOSE IT

(From the Pueblo, Col., Chieftain, November 4, 1915.)

THE present federal constitution wisely leaves this matter in the power of the states. An amendment to the federal constitution giving Congress the power to compel states to permit women to vote could hardly fail to convey the power to Congress to compel states not to permit women to vote.

—

(From the Rochester, N. Y. Democrat, November 2, 1915.)

LEADERS of the suffrage movement will injure their cause in states which vote on the matter this fall, if they undertake to force a favorable vote by holding a Federal amendment over them as a club. They will also make enemies by insisting on the discussion of suffrage in Congress this winter, when questions vital to the security of the nation will have to be settled.

—

(From the New York World, Nov. 4.)

IT IS absurd to think that the suffragists can convince Congress if they cannot convince the people in the four leading industrial states of the East, to say nothing of the Middle West, and especially the South, which is the stronghold of Anti-Suffrage sentiment.

—

(From the Newark, N. J. Eagle, Nov. 3.)

LAST winter there was a strong sentiment in Congress in favor of submitting an amendment to the Legislatures of the forty-eight states for woman suffrage. Congress was not then enlightened as to the popular sentiment. The four State elections recently held show the futility of such action by Congress. The adoption of a constitutional amendment requires the favorable vote of three-fourths of the Legislatures or conventions of the States. This means that it is necessary for the amendment to be adopted by thirty-six States after Congress by a two-thirds vote of both houses has submitted it to the States. And four States, representing a great majority of the sisterhood of States, have spoken.

—

(From the Baltimore Sun, Nov. 4.)

THE defeats in New York, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, it is said, will only strengthen the suffragist efforts to secure a constitutional amendment from Congress. We are inclined to think they will not advance their cause by this "drive" against states' rights. Such a movement will tend to increase antagonism to it.

—

(From the Washington, D. C. Post Nov. 4.)

THE fact that Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania, together with New Jersey, which voted on the question several weeks ago, have now declared overwhelmingly against woman suffrage should restrain the national leaders of the suffragists from making any attempt to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide for national suffrage in the near future.

—

(From the Brooklyn Eagle, Nov. 5.)

THE abandonment of the Shafroth amendment by the National Association is a complete reversal of tactics. It is a vindication of the once-repudiated Congressional Union. It is capitulation to the minority, in an effort to force a minority measure upon states that have given a majority vote against suffrage.

THERE have been no suffrage "Victory parades" since the 2d of November.

THE Texas Teachers' Association, at its annual convention at Corpus Christi, November 27, set a good example to similar associations in other states, when it voted down a resolution pledging the "mild support" of the Association to woman suffrage. The Association went further, and voted that the resolution should not be considered "any quicker than would a resolution favoring immersion as a mode of baptism."

THIS YEAR'S CAMPAIGN STATES

THREE states—Iowa, South Dakota and West Virginia—are to vote this year upon proposed suffrage amendments.

In Iowa, the vote will be taken on the 5th of June, at the primaries. Iowa is a state to which the suffragists have laid persistent siege; beginning in 1892 with a presidential suffrage bill, and presenting resolutions for the submission of a constitutional amendment in the legislatures of 1894, 1896, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1902, 1904, 1906, 1907, 1909 and 1911, only to have them defeated in committee or in one branch or the other of the legislature, until, in 1913, they persuaded the legislature to take favorable action and last year secured the sanction of a second legislature.

In South Dakota, suffrage amendments have been four times submitted to the voters. The first time was in 1890, when, after an active campaign and on a full vote, the amendment was defeated: 22,972 for and 45,682 against. In 1898, the question was again submitted; and, on a very light vote the proposal was defeated by a majority of only 3,285. Encouraged by this narrow margin against them, the suffragists got the amendment again before the people in 1910, but were defeated by a majority almost exactly the same as in 1890—the vote standing 35,290 for and 57,709 against. In 1914, the vote stood: For, 39,605, against, 51,519, an adverse majority of 11,914. The South Dakota voters may well be weary of these persistent suffrage attacks; and, if they want to settle the question so that it will stay settled, the way is open to do it by registering a heavy majority against it.

In West Virginia, the proposal comes before the people for the first time, the ill-considered gallantry of a single legislature being responsible for it.

Anti-suffragists in the four great states which have just rejected woman suffrage amendments should feel a special obligation to do everything in their power to assist in the defeat of like amendments in this year's campaign states. In these states, as in those that have just voted, the aim to be kept in view is the securing of the largest possible majorities. It is only on a light vote that suffrage has any chance of success.

SUFFRAGE AND "POLITICAL POWER"

THE idea that a state which gives the ballot to women thereby increases its political power in national affairs is being diligently pressed by the suffragists.

This idea has been nowhere expressed more crudely and baldly than by the New York American, in an editorial article on the day before the November election, in these words: "If New York fails to give women the vote this year, it will no longer be the State of New York, but the State of Illinois that will have the most influence in electing the next President of the United States; for the total vote for President in Illinois, where women vote, will be bigger than the total vote in New York State."

It is hard to believe that the man who wrote that did not know better. But whether he was displaying his own ignorance or presuming on the ignorance of his readers does not greatly matter. The truth is, as any one with a rudimentary knowledge of the Constitution of the United States knows, that the number of voters in any state has nothing whatever to do with the representation of the state either in Congress or in the Electoral College. The basis in each case is population, not the number of voters. Illinois is entitled to choose 29 Presidential Electors. The number has not been increased because it has given the Presidential ballot to women. It would not be increased if it were to give the vote to minors. New York is entitled to choose 45 Presidential Electors. It would not have been entitled to a single additional Elector, if it had voted for suffrage instead of against it. The relative strength of Illinois and New York remains exactly what it was.

All this is so elementary that it would seem idle to state it, if the suffragist claims to the contrary were not so persistent.

THEY ASKED THE WOMEN

A CAMBRIDGE man, who was wavering in his convictions on the suffrage question, chanced to attend, a few days before the election, a meeting at which both sides were represented. The anti-suffrage speaker suggested that any voters who were in doubt ask the women of their acquaintance what their views were, and vote whichever way the opinions of a majority pointed. This impressed him as good advice. Acting on the suggestion, he asked twenty-eight women what they thought about it, and found only two who were in favor of suffrage. He voted accordingly on the side of the twenty-six.

Something like this seems to have happened all over the state. It helps to explain the comparative evenness with which the anti-suffrage majority was spread over the state—in the cities, large and small, and in the towns from Berkshire to the Cape. Massachusetts men never have been wanting in consideration for Massachusetts women. They have labored for their welfare and have legislated for their protection. If they had believed that the majority of women wanted the ballot they would have voted, by a large majority, to give it to them, whatever might have been their own misgivings as to the possible results of so revolutionary a change.

But, when they turned from the women of the street parades, of automobile and soap box oratory, to the women of their acquaintance, the women of their homes and the homes of their friends, it did not take long to find out what these women wanted, and they voted accordingly. They would do it again, in even larger numbers, next week or next month, if the issue were again before them.

SOME LESSONS FROM THE SUFFRAGE DEFEAT

Illuminating Comments By Representative Newspapers

NO POSSIBLE DOUBT AS TO PUBLIC SENTIMENT

(From the Boston Transcript, Nov. 3.)

THE State's vote against the amendment for woman suffrage is so overwhelming that no doubt can possibly exist regarding public sentiment on this measure of organic law. No proposition could have been put aside more positively. The vote in this State, taken in connection with the similar result in New York and Pennsylvania, indicates plainly enough that the Eastern States are not ready to approve of woman suffrage.

BEATEN BY THE WOMEN THEMSELVES

(From the Boston Post (Suffragist), Nov. 3.)

IN this instance the cause has been beaten by the women themselves. The activity of the anti-suffragists has been phenomenal, and they have handled their campaign with notable ability and astuteness. They have prevailed upon the male voters to declare against the proposition. Therefore, it is clear that before the Eastern States are to declare for female suffrage, it is necessary for the propagandists to first convince the majority of the women that they need and want the ballot.

UNEXPECTEDLY OVERWHELMING

(From the Boston Traveler (Suffragist), Nov. 3.)

FEW responsible leaders of the suffragist cause believed that Massachusetts could be won this year; not one of them looked forward to such an overwhelming defeat as has been sustained by them. It is not enough to say that other states voting on the issue were carried along by the same deep-running current, but it may be stated that causes which prevailed here prevailed also in New York and Pennsylvania.

FOR THE GOOD OF THE STATE AND THE WOMEN

(From the New York Times, Nov. 3.)

THE defeat of woman suffrage in three great eastern states yesterday, following its defeat in New Jersey in October, is unmistakable and ample notice to the suffragists that the old, highly developed, populous, complex commonwealths of the east will have none of a political experiment that some simpler, meagrely settled communities of the west have ventured to make. Whatever its merits or its faults in theory and practice, its rejection in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey was inevitable. It could not be accepted there with the easy carelessness of sparse western populations eager for innovations. The men of the mighty industrial states voted it down for the good of the state and the good of the women. The essential American conservatism, the old-fashioned notion of the position and duties of women prevailed.

NO CHANCE OF A SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

(From the Waltham News, Nov. 4.)

THERE is not the slightest chance of a suffrage amendment passing the Legislature next year. Those who are opposed to it will feel at liberty to come out frankly against it and those who are opposed will be stronger than ever in their position. The indifferent will naturally be with the opponents of woman suffrage because they will have the excellent excuse that the question has been put up to the people and defeated.

A STRAIGHT VERDICT

(From the Worcester Gazette (Suffragist), Nov. 3.)

NO DOUBT the sincere opposition of many intelligent women under the banner of the "Antis" was effective in bringing a large "No" vote to the polls. Political organizations, with few exceptions, if any, were opposed to doubling the electorate because of the greater difficulties it would place in the way of bringing the voters into line for their party or in favor of their issues. But, in the main, it was the straight verdict of men themselves that they will not for the present give women the ballot.

"THE WOMEN OF THE STATE"

(From the Cambridge Recorder, Nov. 6.)

NOTWITHSTANDING the contumacious inaccuracy with which a comparatively few women who seek the suffrage refer to themselves as "the women of the State," the men in these states know on which side of this profoundly important question the most and the best of women stood; and the men took their stand by the side of the great majority of women in accordance with the rule of the majority, which is the supreme rule alike of justice and of prudence in such matters.

THE DISTAFF SIDE OF THE HOUSE

(From the Salt Lake City Herald, Nov. 4.)

IT is impossible to contemplate the result of the equal suffrage elections without deducing that the wives and mothers of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and New York did not desire the ballot. Most men are amenable to the wishes of the distaff side of the house when properly approached.

THE RURAL VOTE AGAINST SUFFRAGE

(From the Boston Transcript, Nov. 4.)

ANALYSIS of the suffrage vote in the state shows that the rural districts are much more bitterly opposed to the change than the cities and large towns. Purely agricultural communities voted unanimously, as in the case of New Ashford, or nearly so, as in Gay Head, where there was but one "Yes" vote to twenty "No."

AN INTOLERANT PROPAGANDA

(From the Louisville Journal, Nov. 8.)

IN their methods of propaganda the women have shown themselves as unfair and intolerant as the men. In their methods of exploitation they are just as blatant and fantastic. The politician in petticoats is for all the world the same animal as the politician in breeches; self-assertive; ambitious for leadership; eager for the limelight.

THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE

(From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Nov. 4.)

TRYING to convert the men to woman suffrage before the women themselves have been converted, and before it is at all clear that anything like a majority of women want it, has always struck us as a rather illogical putting of the cart before the horse.

SUFFRAGE DEFEATS LAST YEAR

IN CONGRESS

In the House of Representatives, January 12, the proposed suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution was defeated by a vote of 174 yeas to 204 nays, with 57 Representatives not recorded. In a full House, the suffragists would have needed 290 votes to carry the amendment. They fell 116 short of that. On the vote recorded, they needed 252 votes. They fell 78 short of that.

IN THE LEGISLATURES

In Alabama, the suffrage amendment for which the suffragists had made an active campaign, did not get out of committee.

In Arkansas, the suffrage amendment was crowded out by the provision that only three constitutional amendments can be submitted at one time.

In Connecticut, the proposed amendment was defeated in the House by a vote of 106 yeas to 124 nays.

In Delaware, the proposed amendment was defeated in the House by a vote of 8 yeas to 22 nays, and in the Senate by 6 yeas to 11 nays.

In Florida, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated.

In Georgia, a resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment was laid on the table by a unanimous vote by the legislative committee.

In Illinois, the resolution for a constitutional convention, for which the suffragists labored, in the expectation that the convention, if it met, would make full suffrage one of its chief considerations, failed to pass the House after receiving a nearly unanimous vote in the Senate.

In Indiana, a limited suffrage bill, after the Illinois model, was defeated.

In Maine, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated in the House.

In Michigan, the suffrage attempt to secure the enactment of a limited suffrage bill failed because the bill was found to be unconstitutional.

In Minnesota, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated in the Senate.

In Missouri, the attempt to persuade the Legislature to resubmit the suffrage amendment which was defeated at the polls last year by a majority of 140,206 failed.

In Nebraska, a limited suffrage bill was defeated.

In New Hampshire, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 121 yeas to 230 nays, an adverse majority of nearly two to one.

In North Carolina, a proposed suffrage amendment was indefinitely postponed by the House by a vote of 68 to 39.

In North Dakota, the proposed suffrage amendment, which passed the 1913 legislature, came up for the required action by a second legislature, but was tabled in the Senate by a vote of 26 to 21.

In Oklahoma, the proposed suffrage amendment was indefinitely postponed in the Senate.

In Rhode Island, a presidential suffrage bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 65 to 31.

In Vermont, a combined presidential and municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 129 to 100.

In Wisconsin, the resolution providing for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the electors was defeated in the House, April 20, and in the Senate, July 1.

AT THE POLLS

In New Jersey, Oct. 19, for the suffrage amendment, 133,201; against, 184,474; majority against, 51,273.

In Massachusetts, Nov. 2, for the suffrage amendment, 162,482; against, 295,939; majority against, 133,487.

In New York, Nov. 2, for the suffrage amendment, 544,457; against, 732,770; majority against, 188,313. Unofficial anti-suffrage majority in Oneida county, 6,154, making the total majority against, 194,467.

In Pennsylvania, Nov. 2, for the suffrage amendment, 385,348; against, 441,034; majority against, 55,686.

A WILFUL MISREPRESENTATION

It is impossible to describe by any more charitable term than a wilful misrepresentation the insistent suffrage claim to represent "four million women voters."

But there are no four million women voters, and the suffrage leaders who use this argument know that there are not. According to the last census, there are exactly 2,097,954 women of voting age in the eleven full-suffrage states. Among these, there are, of course, thousands of illiterates and unnaturalized aliens; but, if every woman of voting age were actually a qualified voter, the total number would be almost exactly one half of what the suffragists claim.

The suffrage leaders seem incapable of learning from experience. Two years ago, they made vehement threats of reprisals for adverse votes in Congress just as they are doing now. The National Suffrage Association picked out nine Senators and nine Representatives, Republicans and Democrats, who were to be "blacklisted" because they had voted against suffrage. What happened? Every one of these men who was a candidate for reelection was reelected.

The Congressional Union formulated this program:

"The individual stand taken by any Senator or Representative, or any candidate for that office, does not affect our attitude in this contest. We are going to make it plain that it is political suicide for any party to ignore our demands or oppose the cause. We think we will make such a conclusive showing in the nine suffrage states that no party after that will oppose us."

But the Congressional Union's attempt to blacklist a party fared no better than the National Association's attempt to blacklist individual candidates. The Union sent special agents into the nine suffrage states to make war upon all the Democratic candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives—doing their utmost to defeat even such conspicuous suffragists as Senator Thomas of Colorado and Senator Chamberlain of Oregon. But the enterprise was a complete failure. The three Democratic Senators who were candidates for reelection were all reelected; and the Democratic representation from the suffrage states in the present Congress is exactly what it was in the last. As that staunch suffragist, Ida Husted Harper, said in the Philadelphia Public Ledger of Nov. 15, 1914: "Gilbert and Sullivan couldn't have wished a more delicious theme than that of 18 little women going into nine big states to administer a drubbing to a dominant political party."

The Congressional Union is now staging the same comedy. But Congressmen who remember what happened in 1914 are not likely to be disturbed by its threats.

AFRAID OF THE VOTERS

THE Congressional Union, which is fast becoming the leading suffrage organization in the country, makes no secret of its unwillingness to have the suffrage question submitted anywhere to the decision of the voters. It expresses the hope, in its organ, The Suffragist, that campaigns similar to those of this year "will not be undertaken again." It insists that "a referendum of male voters on woman suffrage is not just" and that "men have no right to limit or prohibit the political rights of women" and that "the verdict of a referendum of men on women's political status has no moral sanction whatever." "It is far better," The Suffragist goes on to argue, "for women to appeal to the lawmakers gathered at Washington." This will relieve them of the necessity of "converting individually millions of voters scattered over a wide territory." Moreover, Congressmen "must face the disapproval of powerful organizations if they oppose the enfranchisement of women." In other words, the club for reluctant Congressmen is a more effective argument than appeals to voters.

There is another practical objection, The Suffragist insists, to allowing this question to go to the voters. It says:

"One result of a state campaign that cannot be overlooked is the apparent mandate it gives the representatives of that state to oppose woman suffrage in Congress.

"'My constituents have voted against the measure by such a majority,' they say, 'and I could not vote for it even if I wished to do so.'

"It is rather a pity for suffragists to spend their time and money in securing a count of votes against their own measure."

These are curious arguments with which to support a revolutionary change which professes to be in the interest of a larger democracy.

But there is a certain sagacity behind the apprehensions which The Suffragist so frankly expresses. The nine states which have rejected suffrage amendments at the polls in the last two years elect in all 157 members of the national House of Representatives. How many of these Representatives are likely to vote for suffrage, against the clearly-expressed will of their constituents? Yet they constitute more than one third of the whole membership, and would be strong enough, without a vote from any other state, to defeat a suffrage amendment.

A "MENTAL CHANGE"

MISS FLORA DUNLAP, President of the Iowa suffragists, in her recent annual address at the opening of the State Convention at Des Moines, made no attempt to hold up the "moral uplift" idea as the goal of woman suffrage.

She frankly admitted that no great change in the laws was to be expected through the votes of women. "Much the same sort of political life" she said, "will go on, and there will be good laws and bad laws, and good officials and bad, much as there have been heretofore."

What then is the gain that is to be anticipated from woman suffrage? Miss Dunlap expressed it thus: "The granting of the ballot, in each state, as it is won, marks one of the greatest changes in the history of the world in the mental attitude of men, and women themselves, towards women." Miss Dunlap is right. When women precipitate themselves into politics, when they become or try to become political bosses, when they enter into the same sort of political intrigues as men do, and struggle with men for jobs and graft—on the principle defined by the Colorado suffrage leader of "grabbing while the grabbing is good"—when they help to make bad laws and to elect bad officials, as Miss Dunlap admits that they do, there certainly is a change in "the mental attitude" of the community toward them. We do not even have to wait for the actual workings of woman suffrage to see this result. We have some foretaste of it in such a campaign as that we have just passed through in Massachusetts.

But the question for women to consider is whether this change in the mental attitude of society toward them is worth while.

THE BLOW TO SOCIALISM

AMONG the other aspects of the suffrage defeats last year the blow to Socialism must be reckoned.

It will be remembered that the Socialists threw themselves into the suffrage campaign with high hopes. Mr. Debs himself said: "It would be sheer betrayal of our party to let this great opportunity go by unimproved." The Call, the Socialist organ, said: "The last lap is being run, and the Socialist voters should use extra and special efforts to push the cause of woman suffrage past the winning post." And Miss Jessie Ashley, formerly treasurer of the National Woman Suffrage Association, and long identified with The Woman's Journal, writing in The Progressive Woman, a Chicago Socialist paper, said: "Act! Move! Hustle! for the realization of our slogan: A half million Socialist women voters in 1916, and a 50 per cent. woman membership in the Socialist party."

But the Socialist dreams were not realized. There are no half million women voters—nor a single woman voter—to recruit the Socialist party. Dr. Anna Shaw herself is not more aggrieved or disappointed by the result than Mr. Debs.

MRS. PANKHURST'S arbitrary methods have at last brought about a revolt in the Women's Social and Political Union, of which she is the head. At a largely-attended meeting of members of the Union in London, November 26, resolutions were adopted, charging Mrs. Pankhurst with acting without authority, with failure to utilize the Union for some form of national service during the war, and with virtually disbanding and breaking up the organization; and calling upon her for an immediate statement of her disbursement of funds.

THE LITTLE TOWNS

APROPOS of the suffrage claim that it was the "invisible interests," the saloons, the white slavers and other disreputable forces which defeated the proposed suffrage amendment at the polls, it is instructive to glance at the returns from the little Massachusetts towns. Here are some of them:

	For suffrage	*Against*
Alford	17	28
Ashby	39	71
Ashfield	40	79
Becket	37	91
Belchertown	88	221
Bernardston	26	70
Boylston	29	93
Brewster	17	86
Burlington	23	71
Charlemont	41	82
Chatham	40	144
Chilmark	10	46
Clarksburg	39	60
Cummington	35	92
Dana	29	76
Dennis	58	167
Eastham	14	47
Egremont	23	71
Enfield	38	76
Freetown	30	101
Gay Head	1	20
Gill	36	74
Goshen	13	37
Gosnold	6	18
Greenwich	27	49
Hancock	14	41
Hawley	6	32
Heath	17	37
Holland	4	20
Lakeville	34	80
Lanesboro'	37	88
Leverett	19	49
Leyden	7	29
Lynnfield	98	156
Mashpee	7	42
Monroe	3	14
Mt Washington	6	10
New Ashford	0	15
Oakham	16	60
Otis	20	60
Paxton	9	50
Peru	15	27
Petersham	35	87
Princeton	20	75
Richmond	21	66
Rochester	18	59
Rowe	15	36
Royalston	26	69
Savoy	26	46
Shutesbury	7	19
Sudbury	54	132
Tolland	8	17
Truro	14	40
Washington	12	27
Wellfleet	37	85
Wenham	28	131
Westhampton	12	42
West Tisbury	19	46
Whately	17	61
Windsor	18	39

This list might be materially extended, if space permitted. But these sixty little towns gave, in the aggregate, 1455 votes for suffrage, and 3857 against—an adverse majority of almost three to one. This is relatively a larger majority than was given in the cities, where, if anywhere, the sinister influences to which the suffragists attribute their defeat might be supposed to be powerful.

AS TO "MEN WITH FOREIGN NAMES"

WHEN Dr. Anna Shaw, so long ago as May, 1911, declared that "Senator Grady and men like him, bearing foreign names" should not have the right to vote upon woman suffrage, she seems to have originated a sort of slogan which other suffrage leaders have not been slow to adopt.

Dr. Shaw herself gave the slogan a somewhat different form when, at the Tremont Temple meeting in April, 1914, she said:

"There is not another country in the world that has submitted its women to the humiliation that American men have reduced their women to. German women are governed by German men. French women are governed by French men; but American women are governed by every kind of a man under the sun."

In the latter form, the slogan was taken up by suffrage speakers all over Massachusetts, New York and the other campaign states last year; and since the elections, Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, President of the Women's Political Union of New York, has said:

"Never again will I make an appeal to an individual voter. . . . No women in the world are so humiliated in asking for the vote as the American woman. The English, the French, the German women all appeal to the men of their own nationality. The American woman appeals to men of twenty-six nationalities, not including the Indian."

But what is there humiliating about that? And, if it were humiliating, what is to be said of the consistency of the suffragists in pressing a proposal which would double the foreign-American vote?

In aiming these shafts against "men with foreign names," the suffrage leaders are both undemocratic and un-American. It is a fundamental principle of American institutions that alien-born citizens shall enjoy the same rights and privileges as the native-born. We impose restrictions of intelligence and character, but not of birth. "Men of foreign names" have fought in our armies, and commanded them; they have had a share in Cabinet councils; they legislate in both houses of Congress, in the state legislatures, and in city councils, and fill high executive offices; and, until the suffragists raised this slogan, no one ever thought of being "humiliated" by the fact.

The suffrage leaders should devise a slogan more just and more appealing.

THE SUFFRAGE ISSUE ELIMINATED

(From the Fitchburg Sentinel, Nov. 3.)

FOR a long time the suffrage issue will be eliminated from our politics, in all probability. Under the unhealthy effects of the British suffrage agitation, the women here, in sympathetic hysteria, stirred up a great commotion. They scared the politicians in both parties. Under the influence of that scare the issue was put through the necessary two consecutive legislatures and it went to the polls, not as a straw vote, as it was in 1895, which the suffragists scorned, but a genuine vote on the merits of the proposition. They have got their answer, and Massachusetts stands where it did in 1895.

COLD COMFORT

MASSACHUSETTS suffragists are making an effort to extract what comfort they can from the election returns of the suffrage vote.

Because the adverse vote on the suffrage referendum in 1895 was a trifle more than two to one, and that on the suffrage amendment last November was a trifle less than two to one, they insist that the suffrage cause is gaining. And this in spite of an increase of more than 33,000 in the anti-suffrage majority. They should understand that popular votes are not measured by geometric ratios but by actual majorities. It is true that the suffrage vote in 1915 was 75,522 larger than in 1895; but it is true also that the anti-suffrage vote was 108,963 larger than in 1895. The increase in the total vote on the question was 184,485. If the suffragists had polled one half of this increase, their vote would have been 179,212, instead of the actual figure of 162,492. No amount of juggling with the figures can change that fact.

A similar form of suffrage consolation was suggested, the day after the election, by the chairman of the suffrage executive committee, in these words, which have been often repeated since:

"The returns indicate defeat for the suffrage amendment by two to one. This means that we have one out of every three men in Massachusetts who believe in equal suffrage. We have now only to convince one half as many more to complete our majority."

That is meant to seem a trifling and easy task. But what it really means is that more than 66,500 men who, after a long and aggressive suffrage campaign, have registered their fixed convictions against suffrage at the polls are to be converted into suffragists. The Republican candidate for Governor was elected over his Democratic competitor by a plurality of 6,376. Yet no Democrat has been heard to say: "We have only to convert 3,189 of these Republicans into Democrats, and victory is ours." But that would be an easier thing than to convert 66,000 anti-suffragists into suffragists.

The suffrage leaders would be wiser if they were to study the causes of their defeat rather than to blind themselves or to try to blind others to its extent and significance.

DID IT PAY?

THERE is one question which Massachusetts suffrage leaders may well ask themselves in view of the result on the 2nd of November.

In the light of the returns, do they think that their policy of coquetting with the saloon interests was a wise one?

As was stated in the October REMONSTRANCE, Margaret Foley, Minnie Mulry and certain other of their speakers were apparently told off to appear before Bottlers' Unions and brewery employees, to conciliate the liquor interests and to persuade street crowds that woman suffrage would not "take away their beer"; while other of their speakers kept up the "moral uplift" pretence.

Much the same thing happened in Massachusetts that happened in Ohio when similar tactics were adopted. There the state suffrage leader was forced to admit, the day after the election, that "the drys generally did not vote with us"; and her statement was confirmed by the official figures which showed that, out of 88 counties in the state, 58 voted for prohibition but against suffrage.

In Massachusetts, it is not possible to tell from the returns how far the suffrage tactics succeeded in winning saloon votes; but it is reasonably certain that they alienated temperance voters. This appears from the heavy anti-suffrage majorities in no-license cities and towns—and especially in the small towns which never have had a saloon. There the temperance sentiment is strongest, and there the anti-suffrage majorities were relatively larger than in the large cities.

The fair inference seems to be that the temperance voters saw through and were not pleased with the facing-both-ways suffrage policy.

THE WRONG LINE OF ARGUMENT

IT IS perfectly true, as suggested by a writer in the New York Sun, that most men resent the insinuations which are put forth by the leading suffrage speakers and writers that the men have made a failure of government; that the women are so much more honest and intelligent that they are needed to set things right; that the men must look to the women for advice and assistance in preparing and shaping legislation; and that women are always guided by the best instincts, while men are actuated by selfish or bad motives.

But the New York Sun correspondent will look in vain for any change in the suffrage appeal. Here and there a suffragist is frank enough to admit that women will divide about as men do, and that they ought not to be expected to be any better than men; and there is plenty of evidence in Colorado and California and Nevada and other suffrage states to sustain this disclaimer. But most of the suffrage leaders have sex antagonism as one of the main planks in their platform. The assertion that men have made a mess of politics; the idea that every sort of government, municipal, state and national, is only a kind of housekeeping, in which women must necessarily excel; and the claim that everything which now goes wrong in public affairs would certainly go right if women had the vote,—these are the staple suffrage arguments, and suffrage orators would be lost indeed without them.

PREMATURELY IN THE BAND WAGON

(From the St. Louis Times, Nov. 3.)

THOSE who jumped into the band wagon at the outset of the women's campaign, on the theory that the time had come when suffrage could no longer be withheld from the fair sex, are beginning to learn that suffrage can be denied—very popularly.